

## REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action, Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 on the grounds that the phrase in Claim 6 “image generated by counting said binary image, generated by differentiated said image”, and the phrase in Claim 7 “by counting differential information”, were unclear. Also, all of the claims were rejected as being obvious in view of a combination of the disclosures of the cited Sato and Donnelly patents, or in view of the disclosures of those patents when combined with the disclosures of the Matsuda and Iwayama patents. In response, Applicants have hereby amended each of the independent claims of the application, as well as certain of the dependent claims, and it is believed that all of such claims are now in good form and are patentably distinct over the references.

Referring first to the form of Claims 6 and 7, it is noted that the phrases which were objected to on page 3 of the Office Action have been deleted from those claims.

With respect to the rejections of the claims based on the cited prior art references, it is noted that the Office Action refers, at page 4, lines 5-6, to the primary rejecting reference, the Sato patent, and states”

“see col. 5, lines 24-28 and fig. 3 - each tile corresponds to each pixel ‘&’ as black pixel and as white pixel”.

According to this statement in the Office Action, it appears that the Examiner understands that each tile corresponds to one pixel. Such an understanding is incorrect, however, because each tile in a tile image, according to Applicants’ invention, is generated based on “a predetermined size area” in a binary image, and comprises a plurality of pixels (see, e.g., page 28, lines 12-17 of Applicants’ Specification. Accordingly, the disclosure of the cited Sato patent fails to disclose a tile image generation step and a character area extraction step.

In addition, the secondary references relied upon in the rejections of the claims do not overcome these deficiencies of Sato as a rejecting reference.

For these various reasons it is believed that all of the claims are allowable, and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/John A. Krause/

John A. Krause  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 24,613

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 616229v1